



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective 1.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Implement a variety of methods and measures intended to increase awareness of the Project services and resources for children and young adults with deaf-blindness and their families. (*Objective 1.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Project activities designed to disseminate effective practices and relevant information to families, service providers, LEAs, and other agencies include the following: **a)** Brochures have been updated to reflect current services, as well as Project staff availability/responsibilities; **b)** Fact Sheets disseminated during technical assistance activities; **c)** articles have been written in PLUK newsletters; and **d)** the Project Coordinator presented in one of PLUK's VisionNet teleconferences.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) has a toll-free number, TTYs, as well as fax machines, are available in both of the OPI's buildings, and the Project has its own Web site. All brochures, correspondence, surveys, reports, etc., include these numbers and links. The Web site describes the Project, its mission statement and activities, as well as providing access to national links on deaf-blindness. The Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee

is discussing further development of linkages. An additional section has been added to all technical assistance reports. This additional section offers information regarding the Project Web site, as well as other national linkages.

The Project also has a letter of agreement with the parent training agency in Montana (PLUK). The PLUK offers referral, lending library services, as well as a member on the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective 1.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Implement procedures to ensure that important information about Project services and resources, as well as referral processes, are accessible to all key constituents. (*Objective 1.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Feedback from recipients of Project services, as well as Project stakeholders, is gathered using an annual needs assessment, technical assistance evaluation cards, technical assistance summary reports, and technical assistance follow-up interviews.

Information regarding Project services was provided during the Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop in August 2004. Information regarding the services the Project provides is also included in our Website.

August 2004 Summer Institute Evaluation Results - Thirty (30) participants attended the summer institute workshop. Following are two of the questions asked of the workshop participants in the Summer Institute Evaluation Form, as well as the answers provided. A five point Likert Scale was used. Question #15 - I think something in my classroom, home, or community will change as I implement the new knowledge or skill = 4.3. Question #16 - My children/student(s) will benefit as a result of this training = 4.6.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3. Project Objective 1.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Target organizations, agencies and locations for dissemination of information concerning Project services and resources. (*Objective 1.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Different brochures were developed for different “audiences.” In other words, Project staff developed a brochure designed for parents, and another one designed for teachers and/or service providers. Also, the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee is discussing possible additional strategies, as well as changes/additions to our Project brochure.

Project activities were designed to disseminate effective practices and relevant information to families, service providers, LEAs, and other agencies, including the following: **a)** Brochures have been updated to reflect current services, as well as Project staff availability/responsibilities; **b)** Fact Sheets disseminated during technical assistance activities; **c)** articles have been written in PLUK newsletters; and **d)** the Project Coordinator presented in one of PLUK's VisionNet teleconferences.

The following activities also took place in order to target organizations, agencies and locations for dissemination of information concerning Project services and resources: **a)** Project information and brochures were shared at the statewide CSPD meeting; **b)** information was shared during the Deaf-Blind Summer Institute; **c)** the Project Coordinator offered a presentation at the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind Learning Weekend; and **d)** in March 2005, the Contracted Service Provider made a presentation about Project services and future activities at the statewide Child and Family (Part C) meeting.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4. Project Objective 1.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Conduct formative and summative evaluations of public awareness activities. (*Objective 1.4 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

It took Project staff until the second quarter of Project year #2 to review and discuss some of the tasks identified in objective 1.4. Thanks, in part, to the effectiveness of the PPBS, Project staff were able to identify activities that were stagnant or that were not meeting timelines.

Measures were identified and quantitative data regarding the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Also, key respondents were identified and qualitative data on the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Project staff are using evaluation information in the analysis of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives to determine if changes/improvements are needed.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

5. Project Objective 2.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Link child-find activities and processes for children who are deaf-blind with other state and regional agencies' child-find activities. (*Objective 2.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicator 3.1.*)

5.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Project staff have contacted all our Part B partners, and in March 2005, Mary Steenberg, the Contracted Service Provider, made a presentation about Project services and future activities at the statewide Child and Family (Part C) meeting. Part C best practices and Part B guidelines have been adopted to ensure that procedures are family sensitive and that procedural safeguards are followed.

Current level of child-find and referral activities is being monitored by Project staff. The Project's referral process was developed in collaboration with Part B and Part C agencies. Other activities Project staff are performing to achieve objective 2.1 include:

a) Contract with Parents, Let's Unite for Kids (PLUK) – The Project developed an Interagency Service Agreement (contract) with PLUK. The contract makes PLUK responsible for assisting the Project in the following tasks/activities: The PLUK is providing Project services as a central directory of deaf-blind related services providing statewide information and referral contact information, and a lending library of materials associated with deaf-blindness. The PLUK provides similar services to other agencies. The contract with PLUK is for the amount of \$3,000 per year for the duration of the full five-year cycle, and

b) Project staff continues to maintain an ongoing strong collaborative relationship with Montana's Part C agencies. This strong collaborative relationship with the Part C agencies creates informal links/networks with all other agencies responsible for child-find activities across the state. Staff from the Part C agencies makes sure that all children who may qualify for Project services are referred to the Project. Over the years, this has been one of the strengths of the Montana Deaf-Blind Project, resulting in referrals being received on infants and toddlers..



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

6. Project Objective 2.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Provide training and technical assistance to community service providers and educational personnel working with under-represented groups (i.e., Native Americans) about screening and child-find activities for children who are or may be at risk for being deaf-blind. (*Objective 2.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2.*)

6.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

6.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

6.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Project staff have contacted and begun working and collaborating with all Part B partners. Key individuals have been identified by Mary Steenberg. Mary Steenberg is the Contracted Service Provider. She has facilitated a collaborative effort with the American Indians with Disabilities Technical Assistance Center (AIDTAC) at the University of Montana who have agreed to lend their expertise and assistance with this activity.

According to the December 2004 Deaf-Blind Census, the Project provided services to families and service providers of nineteen (19) under-represented group children and youth with deaf-blindness. Of those nineteen (19) children and young adults with deaf-blindness, twelve (12) are Native American (the largest under-represented group in Montana), three (3) are Hispanic, two (2) are Asian, and two (2) more are black.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

7. Project Objective 2.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Implement a standardized user-friendly, multiple-method process for referral to the Project. (*Objective 2.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

7.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

7.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Referral processes were developed in collaboration with Part B and Part C agencies. Part C best practices and Part B guidelines have been adopted to ensure that procedures are family sensitive and that IDEA procedural safeguards are followed.

A simple one-page, user-friendly referral form has been developed and is currently used by Project staff. This referral form makes the referral process very easy for any individual who wants to request services from the Deaf-Blind Project. For that reason, people are more willing to follow Project guidelines for making all new referrals. The referral form includes all the data required to determine if Project staff will visit a child/student. Information gathered from all referral activities is utilized for child count and annual census.

Project staff ensures that all appropriate individuals are notified of a referral for Project services. When a referral is received, Project staff contacts school personnel and/or family members, and ensures that all team members have the opportunity to attend and/or benefit from the services provided by the Project. According to the results of the Technical Assistance Visit Summary, an average of about seven (7) people attended and benefit from each technical assistance visit provided by the Deaf-Blind Project. On an as-needed basis, Project staff will make additional referrals to other agencies, such as PLUK, MonTech, and/or the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

8. Project Objective 2.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Implement eligibility procedures based on Montana's definition of deaf-blindness that validate placement on the Project's census of children who are deaf-blind. (*Objective 2.4 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicator 2.1.*)

8.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Information gathered from all referral activities is utilized for child count and annual census. Effective collection and examination of census data resulted in Project staff developing strategies to increase referrals of Native Americans. This process also guided Project staff to begin a unique initiative especially designed to benefit children approaching transition age.

Project eligibility meets federal requirements due to the fact the Project has implemented procedures based on Montana's, as well as the federal, definition of deaf-blindness that validates placement on the Project's census of children who are deaf-blind. For that reason, eleven (11) newly identified children and young adults have been added to the state's deaf-blind census. At the same time, the census was updated by taking twenty (20) children and young adults off the census. The most common reasons for taking students out of the deaf-blind census were: **1)** current/newly found information did not meet the criteria for deaf-blindness anymore; **2)** students moved and/or the Project has been unable to locate them; and **3)** the young adult arrived at the age of 22. The current Project census was submitted to NTAC in April 2005.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

9. Project Objective 2.5 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Conduct formative and summative evaluations of child-find activities. (*Objective 2.5 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

9.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

9.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

It took Project staff until the second quarter or Project year #2 to review and discuss the tasks identified in activities 2.5.1, 2.5.2, and 2.5.3. Thanks, in part, to the effectiveness of the PPBS, Project staff was able to identify activities that were stagnant or that were not meeting timelines.

The best evidence of results regarding the Project's child find activities is the high volume of referrals received on a yearly basis. More than thirty (30) referrals were received during this reporting period. Most of the referrals are received from Part C agencies. Receiving most of the referrals from Part C agencies means the Project is identifying and providing services to and following children with deaf-blindness at a very early age. This also speaks volumes about the very strong collaborative relationship between Project staff and all Part C agencies in the state of Montana.

The Project maintains its Deaf-Blind Census in electronic format using Microsoft Access. The census is in order, and up to date. During the October 2004 PDM meeting in Washington, DC, Francisco J. Román, the Project Coordinator, was given a token of appreciation by NTAC's census coordinator for being the first state to turn in last year's census information. She also stated that Montana's census information was not only the first one to be submitted, but that it also included all the required information. Also, thanks in part to information gathered from our deaf-blind census, we were able to pinpoint transition as one of the Project's areas of need. For that reason, the Project is beginning a collaborative effort with NTAC's Area 2 Coordinator (Jon Hardin) and the Helen Keller National Center Regional Coordinator (Mo McGowan). This collaborative effort should assist the Project in providing additional services to families and service providers working with transition-age deaf-blind young adults.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

10. Project Objective 3.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Provide Project services to families in an individual family centered, culturally sensitive, and user-friendly manner. (*Objective 3.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2.*)

10.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

10.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

10.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 3.1 are included and summarized as part of Objective 3.5.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

11. Project Objective 3.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Provide individualized support for families to access necessary resources, support services and agencies. (*Objective 3.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

11 a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

11.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

11.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 3.2 are included and summarized as part of Objective 3.5.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

12. Project Objective 3.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Provide a comprehensive, all-inclusive array of technical assistance and training services, based on innovative and best practice methods, to families of children and young adults with deaf-blindness. (*Objective 3.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2.*)

12.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

12.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

12.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 3.3 are included and summarized as part of Objective 3.5.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

13. Project Objective 3.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Incorporate follow-up activities into the delivery of all technical assistance and training services. (*Objective 3.4 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

13.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

13.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

13.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 3.4 are included and summarized as part of Objective 3.5.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

14. Project Objective 3.5 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Conduct formative and summative evaluations of family services. (*Objective 3.5 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

14.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

14.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

14.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.

Measures were identified and quantitative data regarding the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Key respondents were identified and qualitative data on the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Project staff are using evaluation information in the analysis of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives to determine if changes/improvements are needed.

The information provided in this summary demonstrates how the Project is:

Objective 3.1 - Providing technical assistance services to families in an individual family-centered, culturally sensitive and user-friendly manner.

Objective 3.2 - Providing individualized support for families to access necessary resources, support services and agencies.

Objective 3.3 - Providing a comprehensive, all-inclusive array of technical assistance and training services, based on innovative and best practice methods, to families of children and young adults with deaf-blindness.

Objective 3.4 - Incorporating follow-up activities into the delivery of all technical assistance and training services.

Objective 3.5 - Conduct formative and summative evaluations of family services.

Project staff utilized the following GPRA indicators and evaluation tools to determine success, failure, and degree of satisfaction for each technical assistance visit provided to **parents and families** of children and young adults with deaf-blindness in Montana:

GPRA Indicator 1.1 – Annual Needs Assessment Survey, census data, the Project’s Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, and Technical Assistance Visit Summary.

GPRA Indicator 3.2 - Technical Assistance Evaluation Cards, Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, and Technical Assistance Visit Summary.

1. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE VISIT SUMMARY – Mary Steenberg, the Contracted Service Provider, calls the Project Coordinator at least two times per year to perform an interview for each of the technical assistance visits provided by the Project. Ms. Steenberg utilizes the Technical Assistance Visit Summary Form to perform each interview. The Technical Assistance Visit Summary for the period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, indicates the following results:

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

A. The most common purposes/reasons for “new referrals,” “follow-up requested” or “regularly scheduled” technical assistance visits include **(number of technical assistance visits = 65)**:

- functional vision and hearing assessment,
- IEP planning, development and follow-up,
- assistive technology,
- behavioral concerns,
- communication concerns,
- classroom adaptations and accommodations, and
- new placement issues.

B. The primary contact for the “regularly scheduled” person making a “new referral,” or “requesting follow-up” technical assistance visits, includes the following **(number of technical assistance visits = 65)**:

- *Parent = 11*
- School staff = 36
- Part C Family Support Specialist = 27
- Montana School for the Deaf and Blind = 3

C. Technical assistance visits that required special language needs or cultural sensitivities included the following **(number of technical assistance visits = 65)**:

- Native American = 5
- Hispanic = 1
- Hmong = 1

D. Did the family request assistance in the home **(number of technical assistance visits = 65)**?

- YES = 16
- NO = 49

E. Type(s) of Technical Assistance (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Telephone Conference = 2
- Direct T.A. from Francisco = 64
- **Home Visit= 16**
- School Visit = 38
- Agency Visit = 4
- Other: Head Start/Even Start = 6

F. During each technical assistance visit, Project staff were requested to do the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Child/Student Observation = 31
- Vision/Hearing Assessment = 45
- Attend IEP/ IFSP = 27
- Moderate Planning Meeting = 33
- Offer Individual Consultation = 36
- Offer Team Consultation = 48
- Video Review = 2
- Respond to Follow-up Requests = 8

G. Areas of technical assistance addressed during this Project period include (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Assessment (**N = 50**):
 - Vision = 47
 - Hearing = 29
 - Communication = 23
 - Self-Help = 5
 - Education = 17
- Assistive Technology = 32
- Behavioral Issues = 30
- Collaborative Teaming and Education Program Planning /IEP/IFSP = 15
- Communication Systems (calendar boxes, sign language, augmentative and assistive devices) = 22
- Community-Based Instruction = 9
- Deaf-Blindness (characteristics, types, impact) = 38
- Daily Living Skills (personal care, eating, dressing) = 14
- Early Childhood Intervention = 10
- Family Support and Education, including: Strategies for working with child, Sibling issues, and Parent-to-parent support = 11

- Inclusion in General Education (techniques to support students in general education classroom, educational planning in general curriculum) = 22
- Literacy Mode Determination (use of Braille, large print, optical aids) = 9
- Medical Issues (gaining more information about a child's diagnosed condition) = 16
- Orientation and Mobility (independent movement, travel skills) = 18
- Personal Futures Planning (looking ahead into the future of a child/youth) = 7
- Self-Determination = 20
- Sensory Skills Development (vision, hearing, tactile) = 40
- Social-Emotional Concerns (bonding, relationships with others) = 40
- Transition Planning, including: Program to program, and School to adult life/services = 12
- Vocational Training/Employment = 7
- Resources, Information, Linkages, Referrals = 10
- Classroom Adaptations, Accommodations, and Modifications = 3
- Other: Promoting quality end of life for child = 1

H. Team members receiving individual, team-oriented technical assistance or attending the exit briefing include the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- ***Student = 3***
- ***Parent = 75***
- ***Sibling = 3***
- ***Grandparent = 11***
- ***Other relatives = 10***
- Family Support Specialist = 36
- Special Education Teacher = 42
- Regular Education Teacher = 32
- Para-Educator/Instructional Aide = 60
- Speech Therapist = 38
- Physical Therapist = 17
- Occupational Therapist = 24
- School Psychologist = 16
- Behavior Specialist = 3
- School Principal = 19
- Director of Special Education = 10
- School Superintendent = 6
- PLUK = 6
- Head Start = 8

- Social Worker = 1
- Interpreter Aide = 2
- Special Education Cooperative Staff = 1
- School Nurse = 3
- Habilitation Aide/Personal Care Attendant = 4
- Regular Education Peers = 30

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The details of the Technical Assistance Visit Summary evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14 2004 to April 16 2005 are as follows:

The Project Coordinator made a total of 65 technical assistance visits. Of those 65 visits, the most common reasons were: **1)** meet with new school staff, **2)** assessment of deaf-blindness, **3)** functional visual assessment, and **4)** adaptation and/or accommodations. The technical assistance visits were mostly requested by or arranged with school staff (36) and Part C Family Support Specialists (27). Of the 65 technical assistance visits seven (7) required special cultural sensitivities. The Project Coordinator made a total of sixteen (16) home visits. The most common requests made to the Project Coordinator while on-site, were: **1)** offer team consultation (48), **2)** perform functional vision and/or hearing assessment (45), **3)** Provide individual consultation, **4)** moderate planning meeting (33), and **5)** Perform classroom/student observations (31). The Project Coordinator attended 27 IEP/IFSP meetings. Other areas of technical assistance addressed during school and/or home visits include sensory skills development (40), social-emotional concerns (40), communication systems (22), and behavioral issues (30). Team members receiving individual and/or team-oriented technical assistance include: *parents* (75), *students* (3), para-educators/instructional aides (60), special education teachers (42), and family support specialists (36). **The information provided in this summary clearly describes the full array of technical assistance services provided to parents, as well as teachers and service providers working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness.**

2. EVALUATION CARDS – At the end of each technical assistance visit, or attached to each technical assistance report, the Project Coordinator leaves a stamped and self-addressed evaluation card. The evaluation cards ask eight (8) questions using a five-point Likert Scale. The cards also ask two open-ended questions to provide for additional comments and/or concerns. The evaluation cards are designed to offer each team member who received technical assistance to evaluate the following factors:

Likert Scale Questions:

1. Before the visit, I had an opportunity to identify questions or concerns that could be addressed during the visit.
2. I received information that is immediately useful to me.
3. Questions that I had were answered.
4. Information that was provided was clear and understandable.
5. I have learned things I can do to help this child/student.
6. I feel like I have enough information/resources to implement the suggestions provided.
7. The consultant shared information in a helpful and respectful manner.

8. The visit occurred at a time that was convenient for me.

Open-ended Questions:

1. The thing I like best about the visit was...
2. I would benefit more from these visits if...

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The results of the technical assistance Postcard evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, are as follows:

A. The roles of the evaluation cards respondents are identified in table 1. The evaluation cards were completed by a total of 33 recipients of technical assistance.

Table 1

Role of Respondent	Number Returned
Special Educator	(N = 10)
Regular Educator	(N = 4)
<i>Parent</i>	(N = 5)
Family Support Specialist	(N = 5)
Paraprofessional	(N = 1)
Other	(N = 8)
TOTAL	(N = 33)

B. Table 2 shows the results for each of the eight (8) questions asked on the evaluation cards.

Table 2

Role of Respondent	Question							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Special Educator	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.9	4.8
Regular Educator	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Parent</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>5</i>
Family Support Specialist	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.8
Paraprofessional	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Other	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.7
AVERAGE - all roles	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.9
Rating Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree with statement 5 = Strongly agree with statement								

QUALITATIVE DATA:

C. This section cites comments taken **directly** from the two open-ended questions included in the evaluation cards for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005.

Open-ended question 1 - The thing I liked best about the visit was...

Parent

- That Francisco could speak from personal experience,
- Learning XXX could see, up till the visit we'd been told she was blind and that was it,
- Francisco gave me a very good idea of how XXX can see and how to help him,
- Information provided regarding my child, and
- Continuity! Francisco has been a consistent advocate since XXX was in CDC. I'm very grateful for his help.

Open-ended question 2 - I would benefit more from these visits if...

Parent

- None

SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The summary of the technical assistance Postcard evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April, 16 2005, is as follows:

A total of 33 people, **including parents**, as well as staff working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness, returned the stamped/self-addressed Postcard Technical Visit Evaluation. The evaluation cards offer two ways to provide input. The first way to provide input is an eight (8) question evaluation using a Likert scale. **The average evaluation score provided by the parents is 4.8 out of a maximum of 5 (96%).** The average score for all respondents on the eight (8) Likert scale questions was 4.7 out of a maximum of 5. This represents an overall 94 percent satisfaction score!

SUMMARY OF QUALITATIVE DATA:

The second way the evaluation card respondents could provide input to Project staff was by answering two open-ended questions. **1)** Open-ended question #1 - The thing I liked best about the visit was... **2)** Open-ended question #2 - I would benefit more from these visits if... The answers and comments provided by **the parents** overwhelmingly demonstrate their positive degree of satisfaction with the services provided by Project staff. Two of the parent comments that best describe how they feel about Project services are: **1)** “Francisco gave me a very good idea of how XXX can see and how to help him” and **2)** “Continuity! Francisco has been a consistent advocate since XXX was in CDC. I’m very grateful for his help.”

3. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW – A voluntary Follow-up Interview protocol is attached to each technical assistance report developed by Project staff. The follow-up consists of five (5) outcome-based questions. Mary Steenberg, the Project’s contracted Family Support Specialist, performs the Follow-up Interviews. These questions are designed to evaluate project impact on children with deaf-blindness. The five (5) outcome-based questions are as follows:

1. Were specific recommendations made?
☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations?
☐ Yes ☐ No Which ones?
3. Were any of the recommendations impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do?
☐ Yes ☐ No Please explain:

4. Are there other changes you have made as a result of the visit?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please give examples, including any new resources you may be using:

5. Have you observed any “child change” since the visit?

(Is the student displaying any new or different skills or appropriate behaviors?)

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you answered “Yes” to question number five, could you please tell us what the change(s) have been?

QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA:

Fifteen (15) people, including parents and school staff, volunteered to respond to the Technical Assistance Follow-up Interview. The results of the Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, are as follows:

1. Were specific recommendations made?

Yes = 15 No = 0

2. Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations?

Yes = 15 No = 0

Which ones?

- Touch and see environment,
- Planning graph was beneficial to us,
- Adaptations toward independence and hearing/sight adjustments,
- Textures as cues. Walls as safety and reference,
- Using different ways to get XXX’s attention,
- Making the student’s environment “dangerous” so he has to become more aware of it!
- Communication System,
- Seating arrangement and use of large print, and
- ”We will lessen physical prompts for traveling the building,” and “we will implement a transition team meeting.”

3. Were any of the recommendations impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do?

Yes = 1

No = 14

Please explain:

- My student will not walk against the wall, no matter how much I try. He has been programmed for too long to walk in middle of hall.

4. Are there other changes you have made as a result of the visit?

Yes = 13

No = 2

Please give examples, including any new resources you may be using:

- Considering new resources – MonTech, Terry Lankutis,
- More aware of student's abilities, strengths, and how to maximize,
- I implemented the touch and see for navigation. He would not respond to such cues as he has never had to, and they were not motivating to him. So I changed all cues to audio,
- Fewer pencil/paper tasks,
- Using specialist from MSDB,
- Referral to pediatric ophthalmologist,
- Giving XXX choices in using switch toys, i.e., likes/dislikes, and making a chart of this,
- How to work with XXX while doing PT activities,
- ***I was pleased with recommendations of why my child moved his head a certain way or why his behavior changed and why he tired so easily,***
- We've started doing more life skill activities – washing, drying and folding clothes, etc.,
- Better understanding of his world and how I present things to him and longer response time,
- Change the environment occasionally,
- Understanding his line of vision,
- I am more aware of the student's visual limitation in regard to his mobility,
- Where student sits in classroom, and
- Books on Tape are being used for homework reading.

5. Have you observed any “child change” since the visit?
(Is the student displaying any new or different skills or appropriate behaviors?)
Yes = 12 No = 2 Not yet = 1

Additional comments offered by interviewees.

- Navigation has improved, as well as my ability to better serve him knowing his sight and hearing abilities,
- ***Because parent knows how to work with child’s impairment better,***
- Better orientation and mobility within school building,
- One time a chair was in the student’s pathway and instead of walking into as usual, he walked around it,
- He can anticipate next activity,
- He is able to spend more time in classroom,
- Recently we have seen an increase in response rather than echolalic communication,
- Responding “OK” when a request is made rather than repeating the request,
- Even though he is a good reader, his eye fatigue was such that homework reading was very hard. Books on tape have been very successful, and
- XXX is opening up about when he can’t see things.

QUALITATIVE DATA

The summary of the Follow-up Interview evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, is as follows:

The Follow-up Interview consists of five (5) questions. These questions are designed to evaluate project impact on children with deaf-blindness. A total of fifteen (15) people, including ***parents***, teachers, and service providers working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness, volunteered to be interviewed. The fifteen (15) people who were interviewed offered the following answers: **1)** Fifteen (15) said that specific recommendations were made; **2)** When asked “Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations,” all fifteen (15) respondents answered with a YES (i.e., “planning graph was beneficial to us,” “textures as cues,” “walls as safety and reference”); **3)** Fourteen (14) people responded with a NO when asked if any of the recommendations were impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do. One person answered YES to the same question, and he/she offered the following explanation: “my student will not walk against the wall, no matter how much I try. He has been programmed for too long to walk in middle of hall;” **4)** When asked if there are other changes you have made as a result of the visit, thirteen (13) people responded with a YES while two (2) respondents said NO. Examples of these changes include: “more aware of student’s abilities, strengths, and how to maximize,” and “better understanding of his world and how I present things to him and longer response time.” **5)** The last question asked during the Follow-up Interview was, have you observed any “child change” since the visit? Twelve (12) people responded with a YES, two (2) responded with a NO, and one (1) responded with a NOT YET. Additional comments provided when answering this last question include: “Navigation has improved, as well as my ability to better serve him knowing his sight and hearing abilities,” “Recently we have seen an increase in response rather than echolalic communication,” “XXX is opening up about when he can’t see things,” and “One time, a chair was in the student’s pathway and instead of walking into it as usual, he walked around it.”

4. EVALUATIONS FROM THE AUGUST 2004 DEAF-BLIND SUMMER INSTITUTE WORKSHOP – Participants were asked to evaluate this year's workshop. NTAC's Change in Skill form was used to evaluate the 2004 Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop.

Montana Deaf-Blind Project Summer Institute – August 2004

Evaluation Summary (N = 26)

Role of Respondent	Question															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Family (N = 9)	4.8	4.9	5	5	5	2.2	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.4	4.9	4.4	3.5	4.6	4.7
Special Education (N = 7)	4.9	5	5	4.9	5	2.9	4.7	4.4	5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4	4.1	4.4	4.6
Early Intervention (N = 5)	4.6	5	5	4.8	5	2	4.2	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.4
Paraprofessional (N = 2)	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4	3	3	4
Other (N = 3)	4.3	5	4.7	4.3	4.3	4	4.7	4.3	5	4.3	4.3	4.7	3.7	4	4.3	5
Average	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	2.6	4.6	4.5	4.9	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.2	3.7	4.3	4.6

Overall Average: 4.4

Rating Scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

Questions:

1. The objectives of the activity were clearly specified.
2. The presenter was well prepared.
3. The presenter possessed the necessary expertise to meet the training objectives.
4. The ideas and activities were relevant to the training objectives.
5. The media examples and handouts were clear and useful.
6. I had no, or limited, knowledge of the topic prior to this activity.
7. I gained new knowledge.
8. The information met my needs.
9. I am motivated to seek more information.
10. I learned new skills.
11. I learned enough to implement new skills.
12. The training reinforced or refined my present skills.
13. I feel confident that I have the knowledge and skills to share this information with others.
14. The presentation has changed the way I think or feel about the topic.
15. I think something in my classroom, home, or community will change as I implement the new knowledge or skill.
16. My children/student(s) will benefit as a result of this training.

WHAT WORKED FOR: FAMILY

- Length of class, being away from home longer would have been hard
- Was very happy to get the information
- Web sites
- Enjoyed and learned from others in group
- Understanding “functional”
- Note pages
- Videos
- Handouts
- Having copies of the material in packet as well as having slides
- Breaking it up with small groups and video clips
- Everything presented was clearly audible and visible
- Handouts
- Videos were very helpful
- Group activities
- Good handouts

WHAT WORKED FOR: SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER/CONSULTANT

- Great handout/folder
- Appreciated all resources/websites
- Interaction with audience
- Set up a really nice atmosphere
- Calm – friendly – open – not stressed or hyper Wonderful!
- Extra copies were wonderful!!
- Resources – so many resources – was GREAT
- Such a great presenter!!
- Discussion groups and videos help me to get more information
- Videos
- Group work
- Handouts
- Discussions
- Loved the “Everyone on the team ..” handout – it will be wonderful to have it so handy!!
- Loved all the resources – what a wealth of new information
- The videos were so informative and really helped to clarify the concepts you were presenting
- Wonderful that presenter and Francisco keep “tweaking” the workshop to meet the needs of the group and the amount of time we had

WHAT WORKED FOR: EARLY INTERVENTIONIST

- Real life examples
- Impact of introduction using “articles” which brought an emphasis to how “classrooms” look – and shouldn’t! Wow!
- Selection of materials
- Ability to intersperse relevant resources throughout
- Catchy phrases – i.e., “ride your hands” – which really gave a nice visual image
- Wonderful, helpful sheets to write on: “...team should know” and “Resources”
- Group exercises were fun and helpful
- Terry’s knowledge of her subject is awesome!
- She explained her information so clearly it was wonderful food for thought
- To be reminded of how simple this subject matter is
- Francisco Román always works hard to coordinate these trainings – He is appreciated
- The presenter!
- Gave good examples
- Good videos
- Knowledge of topic

WHAT WORKED FOR: PARAPROFESSIONAL

- Lots of examples
- Lots of visuals
- Question and answer input from everyone
- High interest level
- Moved smoothly from one subject to another
- Applicable ideas
- Lots of laughter and joking
- Thank you

WHAT WORKED FOR: OTHER

- Consistency
- Choices
- Positioning
- Using knowledge presented to transfer to student and share with paras and classroom teacher
- Videos were very helpful
- Info on guiding/leading children thru activities
- Info on promoting expressive communication
- Good information
- Good PowerPoint
- Good videos

WHAT DIDN'T WORK

FAMILY

- Outside your control: room temperature, outside noise
- Room temperature was too cold
- Having results of small groups written out on easel. I think this took time away from more valuable activities.
- Mix up groups with a combination of parent/professionals. We had people ask to join our group because we were parents and they were wanting to hear that perspective
- The group next to us was noisy and made it difficult for me to get the most out of the workshop [the motel maybe could have separated the groups with more distance]
- U-shape of tables made it difficult to see slide (but was good for conversation/discussion)

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER/CONSULTANT

- Long sessions of lecture were hard to stay focused although they were interesting
- Noise from other rooms was distracting
- Room was COLD!
- Handouts (Prioritizing Goals ..) that we will copy to use, could be printed on white or yellow. They copy so much clearer than green. (P.S. Wrote this before receiving the working copy to keep for copying – wonderful)
- Could have been more time allotted for information – possible another day or ½ day?

Early Interventionist

- I bet you've never heard this: that it was longer!
- Could have used more time – 2 days(?)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

FAMILY

- As a parent being brought together for 1.5 days with so many others that “understand” what I go through everyday was very well worth my time. In Montana we are so isolated from each other. It was a real gift to spend time with others that share the same passion, kids with multiple disabilities.
- Thank you! This conference was very informative! This should have been videotaped so that we could present it to teachers/parents in our community
- Definitely needs more time!
- Sometimes the input from other parents/professionals is as helpful as the presenter
- Thank you!
- I found a lot of the information to be very helpful to interpret into my daughter's routines. Terry did a wonderful job with the conference and I am glad I could attend

- The most useful workshop I've attended!!
- Good format

Special Education Teacher/Consultant

- Would love to be able to access video/resources @ PLUK: Where to Begin (video), Deaf-Blind Baby (book), Tangible Symbol Systems (video)
- Thank you Thank you Thank you for this opportunity!
- Very beneficial. Please continue providing these.
- UR da best!
- It was nice to have the parents spread out so that during small groups their perspective added so much. Thanks for having so many parents here.
- Great information and resource sites and Terry was wonderful – related to us “regular” guys so well! Friendly, personable and practical!
- Lots of good information. Thank you!
- The workshop was very good at working with my present level of knowledge and adding to that. There wasn't so much information and new knowledge that it was overwhelming! I will be able to make changes in my classroom that will make a difference and will be sustaining. This will make a difference for the deaf/blind children in my classroom. We will be more inclusive and involve everyone in all environments.

EARLY INTERVENTIONIST

- What a great presenter, presentation and learning opportunity! Terry was fantastic – upbeat, calm, respectful, organized, flexible – and she's a great human being!
- Please have Terry come back again and soon!
- Wonderful workshop!! Very knowledgeable presenter, thoughtful, respectful, AND full of good functional information. I enjoyed this workshop immensely. Thank you.
- My time was well spent – Thank you!

PARAPROFESSIONAL

- All of the information that I received is going to help me a lot. This will be my first year working with any Blind/deaf individual.
- Thank you!

OTHER

- I learned a lot from this workshop. The best was the information about DB Link and the places to go to do independent research

Summary of the Evaluation Results for the
Deaf-Blind Project Summer Institute
August 2004

Terry Rafalowski-Welch, in collaboration with Francisco J. Román, was the workshop presenter. A total of 26 workshop participants completed a workshop evaluation. The Project utilized NTAC's Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form. This evaluation form consists of 19 questions (16 questions utilized a rating scale and 3 were open-ended). For the 16 questions which were scored giving a range of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the overall average score was 4.4.

The questions which most clearly related to increased knowledge/skills received average scores of 4.5 and 4.6. Following are those questions and their resulting average scores:

I gained new knowledge = 4.6

I learned new skills = 4.5

I learned enough to implement new skills = 4.5

My children/student(s) will benefit as a result of this training = 4.6

The results of the Technical Assistance Visit Summary, Evaluation Cards, Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, and Evaluations from the Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop demonstrate the high degree of success the Project is having in achieving objectives 3.1 to 3.5.

Please see the discussion of Project objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 (sections 23-26 of this annual performance report for a full description of the results of the Project's formative and summative evaluations of objectives 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

15. Project Objective 4.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Implement a user-friendly process to help education and service provider personnel access Project services and resources. (*Objective 4.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

15.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

15.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 4.1 are included and summarized as part of Objective 4.4.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

16. Project Objective 4.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Provide a comprehensive, all-inclusive array of technical assistance and training services, based on innovative and best practice methods, to teachers and service providers providing services to children and young adults with deaf-blindness. (*Objective 4.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2.*)

16.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

16.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

16.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 4.2 are included and summarized as part of Objective 4.4.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

17. Project Objective 4.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Incorporate follow-up activities into the delivery of all technical assistance and training services. (*Objective 4.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

17.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

17.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

17.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note #1: The results and status of Objective 4.3 are included and summarized as part of Objective 4.4.

Note #2: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

18. Project Objective 4.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Conduct formative and summative evaluations of technical assistance and training services. (*Objective 4.4 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

18.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

18.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

18.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

18.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Note: Project staff have accumulated extensive quantitative and qualitative data; however, the data gathered to evaluate Project progress toward achievement of this objective does not fit the parameters given in this form. For that reason, the quantitative and qualitative data gathered by Project staff will be presented in a format that fits the evaluation methods approved in our grant application.

Measures were identified and quantitative data regarding the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Key respondents were identified and qualitative data on the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered.

Project staff are using evaluation information in the analysis of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives to determine if changes/improvements are needed. The information provided in this summary demonstrates how the Project is:

Objective 4.1 - Implementing a user-friendly process to help education and service provider personnel access Project services and resources.

Objective 4.2 - Providing comprehensive, all-inclusive array of technical assistance and training services, based on innovative and best practice methods, to teachers and service providers providing services to children and young adults with deaf-blindness.

Objective 4.3 - Incorporating follow-up activities into the delivery of all technical assistance and training services.

Objective 4.4 - Conducting formative and summative evaluations of technical assistance and training services.

Project staff utilized the following GPRA indicators and evaluation tools to determine success, failure, and degree of satisfaction for each technical assistance visit provided to **teachers and service providers** of children and young adults with deaf-blindness in Montana:

GPRA Indicator 1.1 – Annual Needs Assessment Survey, census data, the Project’s Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, and Technical Assistance Visit Summary.

GPRA Indicator 3.2 - Technical Assistance Evaluation Cards, Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, and Technical Assistance Visit Summary.

1. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE VISIT SUMMARY – Mary Steenberg, the Contracted Service Provider, calls the Project Coordinator at least two times per year to perform an interview for each of the technical assistance visits provided by the Project. Ms. Steenberg utilizes the Technical Assistance Visit Summary Form to perform each interview. The Technical Assistance Visit Summary for the period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, indicates the following results:

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

A. The most common purposes/reasons for new referrals, follow-up requested or regularly scheduled technical assistance visit include (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- functional vision and hearing assessment
- IEP planning, development and follow-up
- assistive technology
- behavioral concerns
- communication concerns
- classroom adaptations and accommodations and
- new placement issues.

B. The primary contact for the regularly scheduled, person making a new referral, or requesting follow-up technical assistance visits, includes the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Parent = 11
- *School staff = 36*
- *Part C Family Support Specialist = 27*
- *Montana School for the Deaf and Blind = 3*

C. Technical assistance visits that required special language needs or cultural sensitivities included the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Native American = 5
- Hispanic = 1
- Hmong = 1

D. Did the family request assistance in the home (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**)?

- YES = 16
- NO = 49

E. Type(s) of Technical Assistance (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Telephone Conference = 2
- Direct T.A. from Francisco = 64
- Home Visit = 16
- *School Visit = 38*
- *Agency Visit = 4*
- *Other: Head Start/Even Start = 6*

F. During each technical assistance visit, Project staff were requested to do the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Child/Student Observation = 31
- Vision/Hearing Assessment = 45
- Attend IEP/ IFSP = 27
- Moderate Planning Meeting = 33
- Offer Individual Consultation = 36
- Offer Team Consultation = 48
- Video Review = 2
- Respond to Follow-up Requests = 8

G. Areas of technical assistance addressed during this Project period include (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Assessment (**N = 50**):
 - Vision = 47
 - Hearing = 29
 - Communication = 23
 - Self Help = 5
 - Education = 17
- Assistive Technology = 32
- Behavioral Issues = 30
- Collaborative Teaming and Education Program Planning /**IEP/IFSP = 15**

- Communication Systems (calendar boxes, sign language, augmentative and assistive devices) = 22
- Community-Based Instruction = 9
- Deaf-Blindness (characteristics, types, impact) = 38
- Daily Living Skills (personal care, eating, dressing) = 14
- Early Childhood Intervention = 10
- Family Support and Education, including: Strategies for working with child, Sibling issues, and Parent-to-parent support = 11
- Inclusion in General Education (techniques to support students in general education classroom, educational planning in general curriculum) = 22
- Literacy Mode Determination (use of Braille, large print, optical aids) = 9
- Medical Issues (gaining more information about a child's diagnosed condition) = 16
- Orientation and Mobility (independent movement, travel skills) = 18
- Personal Futures Planning (looking ahead into the future of a child/youth) = 7
- Self-Determination = 20
- Sensory Skills Development (vision, hearing, tactile) = 40
- Social-Emotional Concerns (bonding, relationships with others) = 40
- Transition Planning, including: Program to program, and School to adult life/services = 12
- Vocational Training/Employment = 7
- Resources, Information, Linkages, Referrals = 10
- Classroom Adaptations, Accommodations, and Modifications = 3
- Other: Promoting quality end of life for child = 1

H. Team members receiving individual, team-oriented technical assistance or attending the exit briefing include the following (**number of technical assistance visits = 65**):

- Student = 3
- Parent = 75
- Sibling = 3
- Grandparent = 11
- Other relatives = 10
- *Family Support Specialist = 36*
- *Special Education Teacher = 42*
- *Regular Education Teacher = 32*
- *Para-Educator/Instructional Aide = 60*
- *Speech Therapist = 38*
- *Physical Therapist = 17*

- *Occupational Therapist = 24*
- *School Psychologist = 16*
- *Behavior Specialist = 3*
- *School Principal = 19*
- *Director of Special Education = 10*
- *School Superintendent = 6*
- PLUK = 6
- Head Start = 8
- Social Worker = 1
- Interpreter Aide = 2
- Special Education Cooperative Staff = 1
- School Nurse = 3
- Habilitation Aide/Personal Care Attendant = 4
- Regular Education Peers = 30

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The details of the Technical Assistance Visit Summary evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, are as follows:

The Project Coordinator made a total of 65 technical assistance visits. Of those 65 visits, the most common reasons were: **1)** meet with new school staff, **2)** assessment of deaf-blindness, **3)** functional visual assessment, and **4)** adaptation and/or accommodations. The technical assistance visits were mostly requested by or arranged with school staff (36) and Part C Family Support Specialists (27). Of the 65 technical assistance visits seven (7) required special cultural sensitivities. The Project Coordinator made a total of sixteen (16) home visits. The most common requests made to the Project Coordinator while on-site, were: **1)** offer team consultation (48), **2)** perform functional vision and/or hearing assessment (45), **3)** Provide individual consultation, **4)** moderate planning meeting (33), and **5)** Perform classroom/student observations (31). The Project Coordinator attended 27 IEP/IFSP meetings. Other areas of technical assistance addressed during school and/or home visits include sensory skills development (40), social-emotional concerns (40), communication systems (22), and behavioral issues (30). Team members receiving individual and/or team-oriented technical assistance include: parents (75), students (3), *para-educators/instructional aides (60)*, *special education teachers (42)*, and *family support specialists (36)*. **The information provided in this summary clearly describes the full array of technical assistance services provided to parents as well as teachers and service providers working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness.**

2. EVALUATION CARDS – At the end of each technical assistance visit, or attached to each technical assistance report, the Project Coordinator leaves a stamped and self-addressed evaluation card. The evaluation cards ask eight (8) questions using a five-point Likert Scale. The cards also ask two open-ended questions to provide for additional comments and/or concerns. The evaluation cards are designed to offer each team member who received technical assistance to evaluate the following factors:

Likert Scale Questions:

1. Before the visit, I had an opportunity to identify questions or concerns that could be addressed during the visit.
2. I received information that is immediately useful to me.
3. Questions that I had were answered.
4. Information that was provided was clear and understandable.
5. I have learned things I can do to help this child/student.
6. I feel like I have enough information/resources to implement the suggestions provided.
7. The consultant shared information in a helpful and respectful manner.
8. The visit occurred at a time that was convenient for me.

Open-ended Questions:

1. The thing I like best about the visit was...
2. I would benefit more from these visits if...

QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The results of the technical assistance Postcard evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, are as follows:

A. The roles of the evaluation cards respondents are identified in table 1. The evaluation cards were completed by a total of 33 recipients of technical assistance.

Table 1

Role of Respondent	Number Returned
Special Educator	(N = 10)
Regular Educator	(N = 4)
Parent	(N = 5)
Family Support Specialist	(N = 5)
Paraprofessional	(N = 1)
Other	(N = 8)
TOTAL	(N = 33)

B. Table 2 shows the results for each of the eight (8) questions asked on the evaluation cards.

Table 2

Role of Respondent	Question							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Special Educator	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.9	4.8
Regular Educator	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Parent	4.4	4.8	5	5	4.8	4.6	5	5
Family Support Specialist	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.8
Paraprofessional	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Other	3.9	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.7
AVERAGE - all roles	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.9
Rating Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree with statement 5 = Strongly agree with statement								

QUALITATIVE DATA:

C. This section cites comments taken **directly** from the two open-ended questions included in the evaluation cards for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005.

Open-ended question 1 - The thing I liked best about the visit was...

Special Education Teacher

- Francisco was more specific this time – gave us good ideas.
- Francisco put himself in the child's shoes to show me the best proximity for the child.
- Clear, concise assessment of classroom environment and the child's behaviors that signal fatigue or compensation.
- I appreciated the verbal assessment at the end of the day, as well as the written report.
- Time spent talking about goals/objectives for the IEP.
- Suggestions/advice given to IEP team.
- Skill / task / teaching / selection / process sheet.

- The visit occurred in the child's home and before I began working with her – extremely helpful!
- Opportunity to ask questions, and get suggestions and strategies in working with student – very informative. Thank you.
- Positive feedback about current programming.
- Francisco was very helpful with his suggestions and observations.
- Honesty.
- The personal attention given to the student.

Regular Education Teacher

- The one-on-one meeting with you. It helped to have you go through your conversations and some of the tests you did.
- Observations of the student were made and explanations of behaviors were offered.
- Getting input from the specialist.

Family Support Specialist

- Detailed ideas and lists.
- Preprinted immediate handouts.
- Observing the functional eye exam.
- Teller acuity cards.
- Timely report!
- He visited the school that morning, then attended the IEP (at which I was present) that afternoon.
- The helpful information that was provided along with suggestions for improvement.
- Attention to detail and expertise.

Other

[i.e., principal, speech-language pathologist, occupational therapist, etc.]

- Francisco's honesty and frankness about the situation. Francisco is great and an asset to OPI.
- Francisco's manner is professional and comforting. He has a good way to communicate his ideas to us.
- Whole team participated in IEP meeting – LOTS of ideas, no animosity.
- Information in terms I could understand; Modification suggestions.
- That Francisco made sure parents were at the team meeting. Getting parent involvement is so important.
- Francisco spends time observing the student and is able to point out how student behaviors are related to student's visual abilities.

Open-ended question 2 - I would benefit more from these visits if...

Special Education Teacher

- He could come more often 😊!
- More materials/ideas for teaching our student to read; More ideas for future lessons.

Regular Educator

- We had had time to schedule more than one.

Family Support Specialist

- If Francisco wouldn't put his fingers in my closing window.
- Francisco would let me know ahead of time when he is going to visit the school – so I can offer my input as an FSS. (School seldom tells me!)

Other

- I could get more ideas to help my student develop physically,
- The report was not received until 3 months after the visit. The child had already moved, so it was not of much help,
- Francisco's follow-up reports were more timely and more specific, and
- Reports were provided in a more timely manner.

SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE DATA:

The summary of the technical assistance Postcard evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, is as follows:

A total of 33 people, including parents, **as well as staff** working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness, returned the stamped/self-addressed Postcard Technical Visit Evaluation. The evaluation cards offer two ways to provide input. The first way to provide input is an eight (8) question evaluation using a Likert scale. **The average evaluation score provided by teachers and service providers working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness is 4.8 out of a maximum of 5 (96%).** The average score for all respondents on the eight (8) Likert scale questions was 4.7 out of a maximum of 5. This represents an overall 94 percent satisfaction score!

SUMMARY OF QUALITATIVE DATA:

The second way the evaluation card respondents had for providing input to Project staff was by answering two open-ended questions. **1)** Open-ended question #1 - The thing I liked best about the visit was... **2)** Open-ended question #2 - I would benefit more from these visits if... The answers and comments provided by **the teachers and service providers** display their positive degree of satisfaction with the services provided by Project staff. Three of the teacher and service provider comments that best describe how they feel about Project services are: **1)** “Clear, concise assessment of classroom environment and the child’s behaviors that signal fatigue or compensation.” **2)** “The one on one meeting with you. It help to have you go through your conversations and some of the tests you did.” and **3)** “He visited the school that morning, then attended the IEP (at which I was present) that afternoon.”

3. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW – A voluntary Follow-up Interview protocol is attached to each technical assistance report developed by Project staff. The follow-up consists of five (5) outcome-based questions. Mary Steenberg, the Project’s Contracted Service Provider, performs the Follow-up Interviews. These questions are designed to evaluate project impact on children with deaf-blindness. The five (5) outcome-based questions are as follows:

1. Were specific recommendations made?
Yes No
2. Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations?
Yes No Which ones?
3. Were any of the recommendations impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do?
Yes No Please explain:
4. Are there other changes you have made as a result of the visit?
Yes No
Please give examples, including any new resources you may be using:
5. Have you observed any “child change” since the visit?
(Is the student displaying any new or different skills or appropriate behaviors?)
Yes No
If you answered “Yes” to question number five, could you please tell us what the change(s) have been?

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE DATA:

Fifteen (15) people, including parents and school staff, volunteered to respond to the Technical Assistance Follow-up Interview. The results of the Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, are as follows:

1. Were specific recommendations made?

Yes = 15

No = 0

2. Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations?

Yes = 15

No = 0

Which ones?

- Touch and see environment,
- Planning graph was beneficial to us,
- Adaptations toward independence and hearing/sight adjustments,
- Textures as cues. Walls as safety and reference,
- Using different ways to get XXX's attention,
- Making the student's environment "dangerous" so he has to become more aware of it!
- Communication System,
- Seating arrangement and use of large print, and
- "We will lessen physical prompts for traveling the building," and "we will implement a transition team meeting."

3. Were any of the recommendations impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do?

Yes = 1

No = 14

Please explain:

- My student will not walk against the wall, no matter how much I try. He has been programmed for too long to walk in middle of hall.

4. Are there other changes you have made as a result of the visit?

Yes = 13

No = 2

Please give examples, including any new resources you may be using:

- Considering new resources – MonTech, Terry Lankutis,
- More aware of student's abilities, strengths, and how to maximize,
- I implemented the touch and see for navigation. He would not respond to such cues as he has never had to, and they were not motivating to him. So I changed all cues to audio,
- Fewer pencil/paper tasks,
- Using specialist from MSDB,

- Referral to pediatric ophthalmologist,
- Giving XXX choices in using switch toys, i.e., likes/dislikes, and making a chart of this,
- How to work with XXX while doing PT activities,
- *I was pleased with recommendations of why my child moved his head a certain way or why his behavior changed and why he tired so easily,*
- We've started doing more life skill activities – washing, drying and folding clothes, etc.
- Better understanding of his world and how I present things to him and longer response time,
- Change the environment occasionally,
- Understanding his line of vision,
- I am more aware of the student's visual limitation in regard to his mobility,
- Where student sits in classroom, and
- Books on Tape are being used for homework reading.

5. Have you observed any “child change” since the visit?
 (Is the student displaying any new or different skills or appropriate behaviors?)
 Yes = 12 No = 2 Not yet = 1

Additional comments offered by interviewees.

- Navigation has improved, as well as my ability to better serve him knowing his sight and hearing abilities
- *Because parent knows how to work with child's impairment better*
- Better orientation and mobility within school building,
- One time a chair was in the student's pathway and instead of walking into as usual, he walked around it,
- He can anticipate next activity,
- He is able to spend more time in classroom,
- Recently we have seen an increase in response rather than echolalic communication,
- Responding “OK” when a request is made rather than repeating the request,
- Even though he is a good reader, his eye fatigue was such that homework reading was very hard. Books on tape have been very successful, and
- XXX is opening up about when he can't see things.

QUALITATIVE DATA

The summary of the Follow-up Interview evaluation tool for the Project period of April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, is as follows:

The Follow-up Interview consists of five (5) questions. These questions are designed to evaluate project impact on children with deaf-blindness. A total of fifteen (15) people, including parents, *teachers, and service providers* working with children and young adults with deaf-blindness, volunteered to be interviewed. The fifteen (15) people who were interviewed offered the following answers: **1)** Fifteen (15) said that specific recommendations were made.; **2)** When asked “Have you been able to implement any of the recommendations,” all fifteen (15) respondents answered with a YES (i.e., “planning graph was beneficial to us,” “textures as cues,” “walls as safety and reference”); **3)** Fourteen (14) people responded with a NO when asked if any of the recommendations were impractical, too demanding, hard, or impossible to do. One person answered YES to the same question, and he/she offered the following explanation: “my student will not walk against the wall, no matter how much I try. He has been programmed for too long to walk in middle of hall.” **4)** When asked if there are other changes you have made as a result of the visit, thirteen (13) people responded with a YES while two (2) respondents said NO. Examples of these changes include: “more aware of student’s abilities, strengths, and how to maximize,” and “better understanding of his world and how I present things to him and longer response time.” **5)** The last question asked during the Follow-up Interview was, have you observed any “child change” since the visit? Twelve (12) people responded with a YES, two (2) responded with a NO, and one (1) responded with a NOT YET. Additional comments provided when answering this last question include: “Navigation has improved, as well as my ability to better serve him knowing his sight and hearing abilities,” “Recently we have seen an increase in response rather than echolalic communication,” “XXX is opening up about when he can’t see things,” and “One time, a chair was in the student’s pathway and instead of walking into it as usual, he walked around it.”

4. EVALUATIONS FROM THE AUGUST 2004 DEAF-BLIND SUMMER INSTITUTE WORKSHOP – Participants were asked to evaluate this year’s workshop. NTAC’s Change in Skill form was used to evaluate the 2004 Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop.

Montana Deaf-Blind Project Summer Institute – August 2004

Evaluation Summary (N = 26)

Role of Respondent	Question															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Family (N = 9)	4.8	4.9	5	5	5	2.2	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.4	4.9	4.4	3.5	4.6	4.7
Special Education (N = 7)	4.9	5	5	4.9	5	2.9	4.7	4.4	5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4	4.1	4.4	4.6
Early Intervention (N = 5)	4.6	5	5	4.8	5	2	4.2	4.2	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.4
Paraprofessional (N = 2)	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	5	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4	3	3	4
Other (N = 3)	4.3	5	4.7	4.3	4.3	4	4.7	4.3	5	4.3	4.3	4.7	3.7	4	4.3	5
Average	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	2.6	4.6	4.5	4.9	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.2	3.7	4.3	4.6

Overall Average: 4.4

Rating Scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

Questions:

1. The objectives of the activity were clearly specified.
2. The presenter was well prepared.
3. The presenter possessed the necessary expertise to meet the training objectives.
4. The ideas and activities were relevant to the training objectives.
5. The media examples and handouts were clear and useful.
6. I had no, or limited, knowledge of the topic prior to this activity.
7. I gained new knowledge.
8. The information met my needs.
9. I am motivated to seek more information.
10. I learned new skills.
11. I learned enough to implement new skills.
12. The training reinforced or refined my present skills.
13. I feel confident that I have the knowledge and skills to share this information with others.
14. The presentation has changed the way I think or feel about the topic.
15. I think something in my classroom, home, or community will change as I implement the new knowledge or skill.
16. My children/student(s) will benefit as a result of this training.

WHAT WORKED FOR: FAMILY

- Length of class, being away from home longer would have been hard
- Was very happy to get the information
- Web sites
- Enjoyed and learned from others in group
- Understanding “functional”
- Note pages
- Handouts
- Videos
- Handouts
- Having copies of the material in packet as well as having slides
- Breaking it up with small groups and video clips
- Everything presented was clearly audible and visible
- Handouts
- Videos were very helpful
- Group activities
- Good handouts

WHAT WORKED FOR: SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER/CONSULTANT

- Great handout/folder
- Appreciated all resources/websites
- Interaction with audience
- Set up a really nice atmosphere
- Calm – friendly – open – not stressed or hyper Wonderful!
- Extra copies were wonderful!!
- Resources – so many resources – was GREAT
- Such a great presenter!!
- Discussion groups and videos help me to get more information
- Videos
- Group work
- Handouts
- Discussions
- Loved the “Everyone on the team ..” handout – it will be wonderful to have it so handy!!
- Loved all the resources – what a wealth of new information
- The videos were so informative and really helped to clarify the concepts you were presenting
- Wonderful that presenter and Francisco keep “tweaking” the workshop to meet the needs of the group and the amount of time we had

WHAT WORKED FOR: EARLY INTERVENTIONIST

- Real life examples
- Impact of introduction using “articles” which brought an emphasis to how “classrooms” look – and shouldn’t! Wow!
- Selection of materials
- Ability to intersperse relevant resources throughout
- Catchy phrases – i.e., “ride your hands” – which really gave a nice visual image
- Wonderful, helpful sheets to write on: “...team should know” and “Resources”
- Group exercises were fun and helpful
- Terry’s knowledge of her subject is awesome!
- She explained her information so clearly it was wonderful food for thought
- To be reminded of how simple this subject matter is
- Francisco Román always works hard to coordinate these trainings – He is appreciated
- The presenter!
- Gave good examples
- Good videos
- Knowledge of topic

WHAT WORKED FOR: PARAPROFESSIONAL

- Lots of examples
- Lots of visuals
- Question and answer input from everyone
- High interest level
- Moved smoothly from one subject to another
- Applicable ideas
- Lots of laughter and joking
- Thank you

WHAT WORKED FOR: OTHER

- Consistency
- Choices
- Positioning
- Using knowledge presented to transfer to student and share with paras and classroom teacher
- Videos were very helpful
- Info on guiding/leading children thru activities
- Info on promoting expressive communication
- Good information
- Good PowerPoint
- Good videos

WHAT DIDN'T WORK

FAMILY

- Outside your control: room temperature, outside noise
- Room temperature was too cold
- Having results of small groups written out on easel. I think this took time away from more valuable activities.
- Mix up groups with a combination of parent/professionals. We had people ask to join our group because we were parents and they were wanting to hear that perspective
- The group next to us was noisy and made it difficult for me to get the most out of the workshop [the motel maybe could have separated the groups with more distance]
- U-shape of tables made it difficult to see slide (but was good for conversation/discussion)

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER/CONSULTANT

- Long sessions of lecture were hard to stay focused although they were interesting
- Noise from other rooms was distracting
- Room was COLD!
- Handouts (Prioritizing Goals ..) that we will copy to use, could be printed on white or yellow. They copy so much clearer than green. (P.S. Wrote this before receiving the working copy to keep for copying – wonderful)
- Could have been more time allotted for information – possible another day or ½ day?

Early Interventionist

- I bet you've never heard this: that it was longer!
- Could have used more time – 2 days(?)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

FAMILY

- As a parent being brought together for 1.5 days with so many others that “understand” what I go through everyday was very well worth my time. In Montana we are so isolated from each other. It was a real gift to spend time with others that share the same passion, kids with multiple disabilities.
- Thank you! This conference was very informative! This should have been videotaped so that we could present it to teachers/parents in our community
- Definitely needs more time!
- Sometimes the input from other parents/professionals is as helpful as the presenter
- Thank you!
- I found a lot of the information to be very helpful to interpret into my daughter's routines. Terry did a wonderful job with the conference and I am glad I could attend

- The most useful workshop I've attended!!
- Good format

Special Education Teacher/Consultant

- Would love to be able to access video/resources @ PLUK: Where to Begin (video), Deaf-Blind Baby (book), Tangible Symbol Systems (video)
- Thank you Thank you Thank you for this opportunity!
- Very beneficial. Please continue providing these.
- UR da best!
- It was nice to have the parents spread out so that during small groups their perspective added so much. Thanks for having so many parents here.
- Great information and resource sites and Terry was wonderful – related to us “regular” guys so well! Friendly, personable and practical!
- Lots of good information. Thank you!
- The workshop was very good at working with my present level of knowledge and adding to that. There wasn't so much information and new knowledge that it was overwhelming! I will be able to make changes in my classroom that will make a difference and will be sustaining. This will make a difference for the deaf/blind children in my classroom. We will be more inclusive and involve everyone in all environments.

EARLY INTERVENTIONIST

- What a great presenter, presentation and learning opportunity! Terry was fantastic – upbeat, calm, respectful, organized, flexible – and she's a great human being!
- Please have Terry come back again and soon!
- Wonderful workshop!! Very knowledgeable presenter, thoughtful, respectful, AND full of good functional information. I enjoyed this workshop immensely. Thank you.
- My time was well spent – Thank you!

PARAPROFESSIONAL

- All of the information that I received is going to help me a lot. This will be my first year working with any Blind/deaf individual.
- Thank you!

OTHER

- I learned a lot from this workshop. The best was the information about DB Link and the places to go to do independent research

Summary of the Evaluation Results for the
Deaf-Blind Project Summer Institute
August 2004

Terry Rafalowski-Welch, in collaboration with Francisco J. Román, was the workshop presenter. A total of 26 workshop participants completed a workshop evaluation. The Project utilized NTAC's Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form. This evaluation form consists of 19 questions (16 questions utilized a rating scale and 3 were open-ended). For the sixteen questions which were scored giving a range of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), the overall average score was 4.4.

The questions which most clearly related to increased knowledge/skills received average scores of 4.5 and 4.6. Following are those questions and their resulting average scores:

I gained new knowledge = 4.6

I learned new skills = 4.5

I learned enough to implement new skills = 4.5

My children/student(s) will benefit as a result of this training = 4.6

The results of the Technical Assistance Visit Summary, Evaluation Cards, the Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview and Evaluations from the Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop reveal the high degree of success the Project is having in achieving objectives 4.1 to 4.4.

Please see the discussion of Project objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 (sections 23-26 of this annual performance report for a full description of the results of the Project's formative and summative evaluations of Objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

19. Project Objective 5.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Enhance community coordination and collaboration through the guidance of the Deaf-Blind Project Advisory Committee. (*Objective 5.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

19.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

19.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

Thanks, in part, to the close working relationship and collaboration between the Project and agencies like Parents, Let's Unite for Kids and all the Part C agencies, community coordination and collaboration are occurring on an ongoing basis.

The Project held a Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee meeting in June 2004. On two previous occasions (February and May), scheduling challenges required these two meetings be cancelled. Following the June 2004 meeting, with the guidance of the Advisory Committee, Project staff put more emphasis on enhancing community coordination and collaboration.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. Project staff actively seeks advice and/or input from the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee regarding Project activities. The advice and input are gathered through a variety of venues. The two most common venues for communication between Project staff and advisory committee members are:
a) formally, through the annual face-to-face meeting, and b) informally, via e-mail;
2. Advisory Committee members are taking a more active part in facilitating coordination and collaboration between the Project and other agencies such as CSPD. Many of the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee members work for, or are connected with, groups and agencies such as CSPD, the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind, and Blind and Low Vision Services out of the Department of Public Health and Human Services. The membership of the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee also enables Project staff to maintain continuing association with all stakeholders and constituencies dealing with individuals with deaf-blindness in our state;
3. During the previous Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee meeting in June 2004, it was determined that the committee members would be forming sub-committees to assist with Project activities such as information dissemination, public awareness, and services for children with deaf-blindness and their families; and
4. In February 2005, four (4) members of the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee met for a full day to assist the Project Coordinator in developing and writing the Year-Two Self-Assessment Document to the U.S. Department of Education. These members expressed their willingness to participate in the on-site visit, if Montana is chosen as one of the states to be visited during this process.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

20. Project Objective 5.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Seek consumer feedback and integrate it into the planning and implementation of services for children with deaf-blindness and their families. (*Objective 5.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1 and 3.1.*)

20.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

20.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

The summaries of Objectives 3.5 (services to parents and families) and 4.4 (services to teachers and service providers), found on pages **24-42 and 48-67** respectively, specifically describe how the Project sought consumer feedback. In June 2004, Project staff shared the consumer feedback obtained from the evaluation tools presented in the discussion of Objectives 3.5 and 4.4 with the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee for the purpose of integrating them into any additional planning required for the implementation of services for children and young adults with deaf-blindness and their families. At that time, Project staff shared evaluation results for technical assistance activities that were provided until May 31, 2004.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. Topics for technical assistance visits, trainings, as well as topical workshops, come from requests and input provided by parents, educators, and service provider personnel.
2. Project utilizes multiple methods to obtain input from families, including technical assistance evaluation cards, technical assistance follow-up evaluation interviews, and annual needs assessments of families.
3. Project receives input from a variety of sources utilizing a variety of avenues, and compiles the information into a usable format for future planning. The input provided by Project stakeholders is utilized to develop future workshops, training opportunities, and technical assistance visits.
4. The Project uses current technology strategies to ensure accessibility for all consumers wanting to give input on current and future services.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

21. Project Objective 5.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Coordinate and collaborate with other local, state, regional, and national agencies, groups, and organizations (i.e., Montana's Part B and Part C agencies, CSPD, SIG, neighboring states Deaf-Blind Projects, and NTAC) in the planning and provision of services for children who are deaf-blind and their families. (*Objective 5.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

21.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

21.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

As stated in the discussion of Objective 5.1, thanks, in part, to the close working relationship and collaboration between the Project and agencies like Parents, Let's Unite for Kids and all the Part C agencies, community coordination and collaboration are occurring on an ongoing basis. The Project Contracted Service Provider is an active member on the state's CSPD and has regular contact with the other members.

The Project Coordinator has developed an excellent working/collaborative relationship with states in NTAC's Area 2. Workshop collaborative planning, as well as willingness to share resources and work together on activities that could benefit all projects involved, are examples of the advantages of having strong working relationships. Also, staff from the Project have already begun preparations for a future Transition Team Initiative in collaboration with NTAC, HKNC and at least two Montana state agencies.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. Ongoing collaboration with stakeholders, also the Project coordinator serves on the DB-Link Advisory Committee.
2. Collaboration with Council for Exceptional Children, Developmental Disabilities Program, NTAC, Wyoming Deaf-Blind Project; an example of such collaboration is the Transition Workshop which will be offered in multiple sites in Montana.
3. Collaborative efforts with outreach staff from the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind, the Office of Public Instruction's part-time seasonal employees, Parents, Let's Unite for Kids (PLUK), and MonTech, among others, augment the availability of technical assistance and training concerning services for children with deaf-blindness and their families.
4. The Project Coordinator is an active member of D-B/Link (5.3.1); at the time of this report writing, the Project Coordinator is a member of NTAC's Area 2 Planning Committee. This planning committee is working on setting up collaborative training activities and/products opportunities between the projects in this region. An Area 2 Matrix has been developed. It will be shared during a one-day training (tag-along) before NTAC's topical workshop in April 2005.
5. The Project Coordinator was a member of the planning committee for the Area 2 regional meeting. This regional meeting took place in Portland, Oregon with its main topic being "How to Collaborate Across State Lines."



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

22. Project Objective 5.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Conduct formative and summative evaluations of community coordination and collaboration activities. (*Objective 5.4 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1.*)

22.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

22.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

Measures were identified and quantitative data regarding the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Key respondents were identified and qualitative data on the effectiveness of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives were gathered. Project staff are using evaluation information in the analysis of the strategies designed to achieve Project goals and objectives to determine if changes/improvements are needed.

The discussion of Objectives 5.1 to 5.3 (**please see pages 68-73**), serves as the current method to evaluate the Project's community coordination and collaboration activities. According to the information provided in the Project status discussion of Objectives 5.1 to 5.3, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Thanks, in part, to the close working relationship and collaboration between the Project and agencies like Parents, Let's Unite for Kids and all Montana regional Part C agencies, community coordination and collaboration are occurring on an ongoing basis.
2. The summaries of Objectives 3.5 and 4.4, found on pages 24-42 and 48-67 respectively, specifically describe how the Project sought and utilized consumer feedback.
3. Workshop collaborative planning is just an example of the advantages of having this strong working relationship with the state of Wyoming (NTAC Area 1). The Project Coordinator has also developed a strong working relationship with some of the states belonging to NTAC's Area 2 (i.e., North Dakota and Nebraska). Possible collaborative efforts are discussed at least twice a year at the Project Directors' Meeting and the yearly Area 2 meetings.
4. Also, staff from the Project have begun preparations for a future Transition Team Initiative in collaboration with NTAC, HKNC and at least two Montana state agencies.

Please see the discussion of Project objectives 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 (sections 23-26 of this annual performance report, for a full description of the results of the Project's formative and summative evaluations of 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

23. Project Objective 6.1 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Utilize the Deaf-Blind Project Advisory Committee to assist in refining Project activities necessary for the completion and evaluation of Project goals, objectives, and evaluation strategies. (*Objective 6.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1.*)

23.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

23.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

23.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

The Project held a Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee meeting in June 2004. On two previous occasions (February and May), scheduling challenges required these two meetings be cancelled. Following the June 2004 meeting, with the guidance of the Advisory Committee, Project staff put more emphasis on enhancing community coordination and collaboration.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. During the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee meeting in June 2004, it was determined that the committee members would be forming subcommittees to assist with Project activities such as information dissemination, public awareness, and services for children with deaf-blindness and their families.
2. Advisory Committee members continue to be “polled” to determine their availability and preference for meeting logistics (i.e., phone, face-to-face meetings).
3. During the June 2004 Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee meeting, Project staff shared and discussed the evaluation results utilized to develop the year-one report for continuation of funding by the U.S. Department of Education. During that meeting, Project staff advised committee members that a subcommittee would probably be needed to assist in the development of this self-assessment. A subcommittee of the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee, composed of Pam Boespflug, Mark O'Brien, Colleen Fay, Francisco J. Román, and Mary Steenberg, met on January 10, 2005, to share, discuss, develop, and summarize evaluation data that helped in the development of this year-two Self-Assessment report for the U.S. Department of Education. The information and results gathered for the year-two self-assessment will also be used, in part, to develop the year-two report for continuation of funding by the U.S. Department of Education due in the spring of 2005.
4. In February 2005, four (4) members of the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee met for a full day to assist the Project Coordinator in developing and writing the Year-Two Self-Assessment Document to the U.S. Department of Education. These members expressed their willingness to participate in the on-site visit if Montana is chosen as one of the states to be visited during this process.
5. On an as-needed basis, Project staff will offer additional resources and support for subcommittees as they become more active and independent in working/assisting with Project activities.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

24. Project Objective 6.2 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Evaluate, summarize and incorporate into the Project management system the implementation and impact of Project activities and services. (*Objective 6.2 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1 and 2.1.*)

24.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

24.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

As shown in the discussion of Objectives 3.5 (pages 24-42) and 4.4 (pages 48-67), Project staff have already evaluated and summarized the implementation and impact of the Project activities and services. The Project has not incorporated the results of this year's evaluation efforts yet. Project staff will use the data gathered for this performance report and present it to the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee for additional input. After meeting with and receiving input from the advisory committee, Project staff will convene to incorporate any needed changes, modifications, or improvements into the management system.

Scores and comments gathered through the Project's evaluation efforts will be integrated with the input provided by the advisory committee in order to follow the steps established in the Project's Management Plan. The action plan established in the grant application states that Project activities that continue unchanged will flow again through Components 7-10 of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS). **If Project activities/timelines need to be modified, as established by the Project evaluation results presented in this performance report and the input provided by the advisory committee, the process will begin at Component 3 and flow through Component 10.** Steps number six (6) and ten (10) of the PPBS will determine any new directions the Project needs to take to continue providing the high-excellence/best-practices services possible.

For reference purposes, the PPBS steps explained in the grant application narrative are included below.

1) Project objectives are specified, analyzed, and based on the Project's goals; **2)** Project activities are analyzed and specified for each objective; **3)** Alternatives for accomplishing objectives are explored to determine effective and economical methods for achieving the goals; **4)** Project personnel determine responsibility assignments for activities and establish timelines; **5)** Project activities, responsibility assignments, and timelines guide Project implementation and become the basis for determining performance status, and providing feedback for continuous improvement; **6)** Project activities may be redefined if Project evaluation indicates alternative action is required; **7)** Implementation of Project goals, objectives and activities are initiated and monitored quarterly through Project meetings and individual reporting; **8)** Minor adjustments are made and communicated across Project personnel on an as-needed basis; **9)** Quarterly progress reports are made to evaluate program status and accomplishments by a) monitoring status of activities planned and completed, b) evaluating scheduled, but not completed, activities to determine appropriate action, c) determining the percentage of activities in progress or accomplished, d) monitoring the timelines of each implemented activity, e) reallocating resources/budget, if necessary, and f) utilizing progress reports to help establish if corrective management is necessary; **10)** Recommendations from the above evaluation component are communicated across Project personnel partners and implemented.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. Formative and Summative evaluation measures have been developed and implemented to assess and evaluate Project goals 1-5. Some have been identified from outside sources (i.e., NTAC forms).

2. The Contracted Service Provider collects all formative and summative data. The Project Coordinator performs an assessment and analysis of the collected data. Data is then utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of Project goals and activities. Also, the collected data is shared with the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee for the purpose of requesting additional input that may result in additional changes/improvements that may lead to the provision of better services.

3. The data collected from Project activities 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 are summarized in the reports prepared for the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee, as well as the U.S. Department of Education.

4. Extensive and useful reports are developed from the data collected from Project activities 6.2.1 and 6.2.2. These reports offer detailed explanations of the extent to which the Project is responsive to the critical needs of children and young adults with deaf-blindness and their families. The results and reports developed from Project activities 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 enable Project staff to improve outcomes for children and young adults with deaf-blindness and their families.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

25. Project Objective 6.3 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Manage Project implementation to guarantee the timely and successful completion of Project objectives and activities. (*Objective 6.3 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicator 2.1.*)

25.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

As stated in the Management Plan section of the grant application, Project staff will convene to incorporate any needed changes, modifications, or improvements into the management system. Scores and comments gathered through the Project's evaluation efforts will be integrated with the input provided by the advisory committee in order to follow the steps established in the Project's Management Plan. The action plan established in the grant application states that Project activities that continue unchanged will flow again through Components 7-10 of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS). **If Project activities/timelines need to be modified as established by the Project evaluation results presented in this performance report and the input provided by the advisory committee, the process will begin at Component 3 and flow through Component 10.** Steps number six (6) and ten (10) of the PPBS will determine any new directions the Project needs to take to continue providing the high-excellence/best-practices services possible.

Project staff have met two times since April 14, 2004. These meetings are designed to ensure that Project staff adhere to the timelines established in the grant application. The Contracted Service Provider is assisting the Project Coordinator to meet the timelines established in the Project Timelines table included in Appendix I of the grant application. These meetings also assist in ensuring that Project staff maintain a clear understanding of their individual and team responsibilities established in the Project Goals and Activities Responsibilities Assignments table included in Appendix G of the grant application.

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. The table of milestones, objectives, activities, responsibility assignments and scheduled completion dates was reviewed at the end of the first project year. A decision was made to review these Project tasks semiannually in the future.
2. Project staff reviewed all activities and associated timelines employing a Program Planning and Budgeting System (PPBS).
3. Meetings between staff and independent contractors working with the Deaf-Blind Project were conducted to review progress, status of objectives, activities, services, and timelines.



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): **H326C030038**

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

26. Project Objective 6.4 [] Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

Make use of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Indicators to assess the accountability of all services provided by the Project. (Further information detailing how the Project will respond to the GPRA Indicators can be found on item 4.7 of the Management Plan Section of this proposal.) (*Objective 1.1 will be assessed through the use of GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2.*)

26.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

26.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High-Quality Methods and Materials	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

26.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

26.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results	Program	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

QUALITATIVE DATA:

As stated in the grant application, and shown/documented throughout this Annual Performance Report, Project staff are using the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) to assess the accountability of **all** services provided by the Project. The GPRA Indicators interrelated to Project goals, objectives, and activities that are being used to evaluate the services provided by the Project are:

Indicator 1.1 – Response to Critical Needs of Children with Disabilities and Their Families

Indicator 2.1 – Projects Use High Quality Methods and Materials

Indicator 3.1 – Communication with Target Audiences

Indicator 3.2 – Practitioners Use Results

As shown in the discussion of the Objective Project Status Chart for each Project Objective throughout this Annual Performance Report, the Project is responding to the GPRA Indicators by using the following evaluation tools/strategies:

Indicator 1.1 – Annual Needs Assessment Survey, census data, input from advisory committee, and the Project’s Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, Technical Assistance Visit Summary, and NTAC’s Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form

Indicator 2.1 - input from advisory committee, and other state and national data sources, and NTAC’s Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form

Indicator 3.1 - input from advisory committee, and input from consumers of Montana’s Parent Training and Information Center (PLUK)

Indicator 3.2 - Technical Assistance Evaluation Cards, Technical Assistance Follow-Up Interview, Technical Assistance Visit Summary, and NTAC’s Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form

Following is a list of the Project objectives and the GPRA indicator(s) used to assess its effectiveness:

Project Objectives	GPRA Indicators
Objective 1.1	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 1.2	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 1.3	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 1.4	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 2.1	GPRA Indicator 3.1
Objective 2.2	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2
Objective 2.3	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 2.4	GPRA Indicator 2.1
Objective 2.5	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 3.1	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2
Objective 3.2	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 3.1 and 3.2
Objective 3.3	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2
Objective 3.4	GPRA Indicators 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2
Objective 3.5	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2
Objective 4.1	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 4.2	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.2
Objective 4.3	GPRA Indicators 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2
Objective 4.4	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2
Objective 5.1	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 5.2	GPRA Indicators 1.1 and 3.1
Objective 5.3	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 5.4	GPRA Indicators 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 6.1	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1
Objective 6.2	GPRA Indicators 1.1 and 2.1
Objective 6.3	GPRA Indicator 2.1
Objective 6.4	GPRA Indicators 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2

RELEVANT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- Through the use of the Technical Assistance Evaluation Cards, Technical Assistance Follow-up Interview, Technical Assistance Visit Summary and NTAC's Change of Knowledge and Skill Evaluation Form, Project staff can assess whether the critical needs of children and young adults with deaf-blindness and their families are being met. These tools also assist in evaluating the results of Project activities that can be used in state and local programs to further improve outcomes for deaf-blind children and young adults and their families.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

During the **Grant Performance Report For The Period Of** October 1, 2003, to April 14, 2004, Project staff were unable to spend the funds expected in the grant application.

For this Annual Performance Report (April 14, 2004, to April 16, 2005, Project staff are planning to expend all its funds by making an addition/change to the Annual Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop. The grant application states that 25 participants will be invited to attend. Due to the extra funds available during this Project period, a total of 50 participants will be invited to attend the Annual Deaf-Blind Summer Institute Workshop. Also, two (2) presenters will share the presentation. The presenters for this year's summer institute are Terry Rafalowski Welch and Carolyn Monaco.

After the Deaf-Blind Summer Institute, the Project Coordinator and the Contracted Service Provider will review all Project expenditures for this year to determine if further changes are needed to balance the budget. No further budget changes are expected at this time.

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project staff consider that we are a little bit behind schedule on some of these Project activities. Activities 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 are scheduled to take place during the current Project year. As we develop this Annual Performance Report document, Project staff are in the process of setting the parameters for a three-way collaborative effort between the Montana Deaf-Blind Project, NTAC, and the Helen Keller National Center. The main topic/reason for this collaborative effort is to increase knowledge and improve post-school transition opportunities for young adults with deaf-blindness in Montana. Even though they look good at this time, these efforts should have begun by the second quarter of Project year one. Project staff continue to collaborate and work together with most, if not all, groups and agencies in the state of Montana for the purpose of providing the most effective services to children and young adults with deaf-blindness. With the exception of activities 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 4.2.9, all Project activities identified in priority (d) will be maintained at the current level of effort. Project staff will try to expedite the efforts written in Project Activities 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 4.2.9.

2. All proposed Project activities designed to address objective 3.4 are active and on schedule with the exception of activity 3.4.3. Due to the redundant nature of such a tool, Project staff have not developed, nor plan to develop a Technical Assistance Follow-up Plan. At this time, all technical assistance follow-up visits and efforts are being documented through the technical assistance summary reports. With the exception of activity 3.4.3, Project staff plan to continue using the tools/processes designed to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies in achieving program goals and activities.

3. Project staff are on schedule and doing a good job with activity 4.3.4, and to some extent with activity 4.3.1. The reality of our service delivery model, as well as availability of Project staff, among other factors, have not permitted us to perform activities 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 as written in the proposal. Due to the redundant nature of such a tool, Project staff have not developed, nor plan to develop a Technical Assistance Follow-up Plan. Project staff will either rephrase or delete Project Activities 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 to better reflect current follow-up opportunities. Project staff are on schedule and doing a good job with Project Activities 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.8, 4.3.4, and to some extent with activity 4.3.1. After requesting advice from the Deaf-Blind Advisory Committee, Project staff will either rephrase or delete Project Activities 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 to better reflect current follow-up opportunities